



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/013,119	12/07/2001	Ferdouse Khaleque	005793P001	9450

7590 10/18/2004

Bradley J. Berezna
Burgess & Berezna, LLP
Suit 180
800 West El Camino Real
Mountain View, CA 94040

EXAMINER

MITCHELL, JASON D

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2124

DATE MAILED: 10/18/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/013,119

Applicant(s)

KHALEQUE, FERDOUSE

Examiner

Jason Mitchell

Art Unit

2124

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 07 December 2001.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-36 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-36 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 07 December 2001 is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☒ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 12/7/01.
- ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is in response to an application filed on 12/07/2001.
2. Claims 1-36 are pending in this case.

Drawings

3. The drawings are objected to as failing to comply with 37 CFR 1.84(p)(4) because reference character "Fig 2A, 207" has been used to designate both 'Data Manipulation' and 'Database (SQL/Oracle)'. Corrected drawing sheets in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121(d) are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. Any amended replacement drawing sheet should include all of the figures appearing on the immediate prior version of the sheet, even if only one figure is being amended. The replacement sheet(s) should be labeled "Replacement Sheet" in the page header (as per 37 CFR 1.84(c)) so as not to obstruct any portion of the drawing figures. If the changes are not accepted by the examiner, the applicant will be notified and informed of any required corrective action in the next Office action. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

4. Figures 1, 2A and 2B should be designated by a legend such as --Prior Art-- because only that which is old is illustrated. See MPEP § 608.02(g). Corrected drawings in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121(d) are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. The replacement sheet(s) should be labeled "Replacement Sheet" in the page header (as per 37 CFR 1.121(d)) so as not to obstruct any portion of the drawing figures. If the changes are not accepted by the examiner, the

applicant will be notified and informed of any required corrective action in the next Office action. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

5. The drawings are objected to as failing to comply with 37 CFR 1.84(p)(5) because they include the following reference character(s) not mentioned in the description: Fig 5C server 505. Corrected drawing sheets in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121(d), or amendment to the specification to add the reference character(s) in the description in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121(b) are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. Any amended replacement drawing sheet should include all of the figures appearing on the immediate prior version of the sheet, even if only one figure is being amended. The replacement sheet(s) should be labeled "Replacement Sheet" in the page header (as per 37 CFR 1.84(c)) so as not to obstruct any portion of the drawing figures. If the changes are not accepted by the examiner, the applicant will be notified and informed of any required corrective action in the next Office action. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

6. The drawings are objected to as failing to comply with 37 CFR 1.84(p)(4) because reference character "Fig. 5E 562" has been used to designate both 'Web Server' and 'Redundant Storage Systems'. Corrected drawing sheets in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121(d) are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. Any amended replacement drawing sheet should include all of the figures appearing on the immediate prior version of the sheet, even if only one figure is being amended. The replacement sheet(s) should be labeled "Replacement Sheet" in the page header (as per 37 CFR 1.84(c)) so as not to obstruct any portion of the

drawing figures. If the changes are not accepted by the examiner, the applicant will be notified and informed of any required corrective action in the next Office action. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

7. The drawings are objected to as failing to comply with 37 CFR 1.84(p)(5) because they do not include the following reference sign(s) mentioned in the description: Fig 5C 525. Corrected drawing sheets in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121(d) are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. Any amended replacement drawing sheet should include all of the figures appearing on the immediate prior version of the sheet, even if only one figure is being amended. The replacement sheet(s) should be labeled "Replacement Sheet" in the page header (as per 37 CFR 1.84(c)) so as not to obstruct any portion of the drawing figures. If the changes are not accepted by the examiner, the applicant will be notified and informed of any required corrective action in the next Office action. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

8. The drawings are objected to as failing to comply with 37 CFR 1.84(p)(5) because they do not include the following reference sign(s) mentioned in the description: Fig 13 803. Corrected drawing sheets in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121(d) are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. Any amended replacement drawing sheet should include all of the figures appearing on the immediate prior version of the sheet, even if only one figure is being amended. The replacement sheet(s) should be labeled "Replacement Sheet" in the page header (as per 37 CFR 1.84(c)) so as not to obstruct any portion of the drawing figures. If the

Art Unit: 2124

changes are not accepted by the examiner, the applicant will be notified and informed of any required corrective action in the next Office action. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

9. The drawings are objected to as failing to comply with 37 CFR 1.84(p)(5) because they include the following reference character(s) not mentioned in the description: Fig. 13, 805. Corrected drawing sheets in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121(d), or amendment to the specification to add the reference character(s) in the description in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121(b) are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. Any amended replacement drawing sheet should include all of the figures appearing on the immediate prior version of the sheet, even if only one figure is being amended. The replacement sheet(s) should be labeled "Replacement Sheet" in the page header (as per 37 CFR 1.84(c)) so as not to obstruct any portion of the drawing figures. If the changes are not accepted by the examiner, the applicant will be notified and informed of any required corrective action in the next Office action. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

Claim Objections

Claim 10 is objected to under 37 CFR 1.75(c), as being of improper dependent form for failing to further limit the subject matter of a previous claim. Applicant is required to cancel the claim(s), or amend the claim(s) to place the claim(s) in proper dependent form, or rewrite the claim(s) in independent form. The parent claim (claim 8) describes 'the state of the objects' being maintained in 'the database table', and this claim (claim

10) describes the 'state of the objects' being maintained in any software component including 'the database table' thereby broadening the scope of the claimed invention.

Claim 36 is objected to because of the following informalities: The claim describes the client handling the data without repeated requests to the client. It would seem apparent that applicant intended to claim the client handling the data without repeated requests to a server, and for the purposes of this action the claim will be examined as if this were claimed. Appropriate correction or further explanation is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

10. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

11. Claims 8-10, 12-14, 18, 24-25, 27 and 29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claim 8 recites the limitation "the state of the objects" in line 1. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim. For the purposes of this examination, examiner's best understanding will be used and this phrase will be taken to mean the state of the data objects associated with the user created form.

Claim 9 recites the limitation "the tables" in line 2. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim. For the purposes of this examination, examiner's best understanding will be used and this phrase will be taken to mean the collection of tables within the server database.

Claim 10 recites the limitation "the database table format and software containers" in lines 2-3. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim. For the purposes of this examination, examiner's best understanding will be used and this phrase will be taken to mean the database storage means.

Claim 12 recites the limitations "the operating system information" and "the operating system" in lines 1-2 and line 2 respectively. There is insufficient antecedent basis for these limitations in the claim. For the purposes of this examination, examiner's best understanding will be used and these phrases will be taken to indicate information regarding the client's operating system being stored on the server.

Claim 13 recites the limitation "the objects" in line 2. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim. For the purposes of this examination, examiner's best understanding will be used and this phrase will be taken to mean the collection of data objects and user created form objects.

Claim 14 recites the limitation "the objects" in line 2. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim. For the purposes of this examination, examiner's best understanding will be used and this phrase will be taken to mean the collection of data objects and user created form objects.

Claim 18 recites the limitation "the second computer" in lines 1-2. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim. For the purposes of this examination, examiner's best understanding will be used and the claim will be treated as establishing a Client-Server relationship.

Claim 24 recites the limitation "the server system" in lines 2-3. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim. For the purposes of this examination, examiner's best understanding will be used and the claim will be treated as if a server system was claimed in claim 19.

Claim 25 recites the limitation "the server system" in line 3. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim. See the objection of claim 24 above.

Claim 27 recites the limitation "the computer" in line 5. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim. For the purposes of this examination, examiner's best understanding will be used and this phrase will be taken to refer to a server holding GUI form data.

Claim 29 recites the limitation "the computer" in line 2. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim. See the objection of claim 27 above.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

12. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

13. **Claims 1-33 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over US 6,750,885 Finch et al. (Finch).**

Regarding Claims 1, 19 and 27: Finch discloses a method of operation for a computer coupled to a network (col. 15, lines 12-13 'server receives and establishes a connection

with a user'), comprising: receiving a form description program by the computer over the network (col. 15, lines 30-33 'provides the options to the user for making changes to the GUI'); executing the form description program on the computer to generate a form having a state (col. 15, lines 30-33 'making changes to the GUI'), the state depending on one or more application program variables (col. 15, lines 49-52 'definitions can be in the form of fixed data values'); changing an application program variable to a new application program variable (col. 15, lines 53-54 'accepting and modifying the GUI screen definitions').

Finch does not explicitly disclose using a cookie to store the state information of the user generated GUI, but The Microsoft Computer Dictionary 5th ed. defines a cookie as '... a block of data that a Web server stores on a client system ...'. Given this definition it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention

to use one or more cookies to store the data and changes generated by the GUI editing process as well as any information entered into the form once it was generated, because the data would need to be stored on the client in a format that was easily transferred to and from a Web server (Fig 2. client 204 and TKET server 208).

Regarding Claims 2, 20 and 28: the rejections of claims 1, 19 and 27 are incorporated, respectively; further, Finch discloses storing the one or more application program variables in a string on the client computer (col. 7 lines 42-45 'terminals usually employ hypertext mark-up language (HTML) for creating World Wide Web Pages').

Regarding Claim 3 and 21: The rejections of claims 1 and 19 are incorporated; further Finch discloses generating a user interface from execution of the form description

program (col. 16, lines 10-14 'generating a GUI screen'); and selecting one or more templates from the user interface (col. 12, lines 14-16 'a GUI screen page having a default arrangement').

Regarding Claim 4 and 22: The rejections of claims 3 and 19 are incorporated, respectively; further, Finch discloses entering a name on a field of the one or more templates (col. 13, lines 31-37 'the user may ... select ... alternate names').

Regarding Claim 5: The rejection of claim 1 is incorporated; further Finch discloses entering data on the form (col. 9, lines 55-57 'enter ... time and or expense information').

Regarding Claim 6: The rejection of claim 1 is incorporated; further Finch discloses transmitting the form over the network from the computer to a second computer; and storing the form on the second computer (col. 15, lines 53-58 'storing the received GUI screen definitions').

Regarding Claim 7 and 24: The rejections of claims 6 and 19 are incorporated respectively; further Finch discloses one or more application program variables associated with the form are stored in a database table in the second computer (col. 15, lines 53-58 'storing the received GUI screen definitions').

Regarding Claim 8: The rejection of claim 7 is incorporated; further Finch discloses the state of the objects is maintained in the database table (col. 6, lines 48-42 'information is uploaded ... to the TKET server where it is stored').

Regarding Claim 9: The rejection of claim 8 is incorporated; further, Finch discloses state queries and interrogation between objects is conducted through the tables (col.

15, lines 5-9 'reporter 840 must communicate with database 216 to properly generate the time and expense tracking reports').

Regarding Claim 10: The rejection of claim 8 is incorporated; further, Finch discloses software to hold the state of the objects can be any software component including the database table format and software containers (col. 6, lines 48-42 'information is uploaded ... to the TKET server where it is stored').

Regarding Claim 11: The rejection of claim 10 is incorporated, further Finch discloses holding application source code in the software component (col. 15, lines 48-51 'GUI screen page definitions ... in the form of ... text'), the application source code accessible by the client through the network (col. 16, lines 12-13 'generating a GUI screen page to the user').

Regarding Claim 12: The rejection of claim 10 is incorporated; further, Finch discloses holding the operating system information, the operating system being accessible by the client through the network (col. 9, lines 29-33 'examines the contents of a database ... to determine the terminal type')

Regarding Claim 13: The rejection of claim 7 is incorporated; further, Finch discloses accessing the database table by a master controller to obtain state information associated with the objects (col. 8, lines 27-29 'TKET server 208 also is coupled to database 216 that is for storing ... GUI screen display parameters').

Regarding Claim 14, 23 and 29: The rejections of claims 7, 19 and 27 are incorporated, respectively; further, Finch discloses transmitting state information

associated with the objects to the database table (col. 15, lines 48-49 'the TKET server receives the user's screen page definitions').

Regarding Claim 15, 25 and 31: The rejections of claims 14, 19 and 30 are incorporated, respectively; further Finch discloses issuing a request over the network by the computer (col. 15, lines 12-13 'server receives and establishes a connection with a user'), and transmitting the form from the second computer to the computer in response to the request (col. 15, lines 30-33 'server ... provides the options to the user').

Regarding Claim 16: The rejection of claim 15 is incorporated; further, Finch discloses reconstructing the form on the computer (col. 16, lines 11-13 'generating a GUI screen').

Regarding Claim 17 and 26: The rejections of claims 1 and 19 are incorporated, respectively; further, Finch discloses the (client) computer receives the form description program from a hyper-text markup language ("HTML") page stored on a second (server) computer (col. 16, lines 36-39 '(HTML) is appropriate for a full GUI screen page being transmitted').

Regarding Claim 18: The rejection of claim 1 is incorporated; further Finch discloses the computer is a client and the second computer is a server (col. 15, lines 12-13 'the TKET server receives and establishes a connection with a user').

Regarding Claim 30: The rejection of claim 29 is incorporated; further, Finch discloses accessing the database table by a master controller to obtain state information associated with the objects (col. 8, lines 27-29 'TKET server 208 also is coupled to database 216 that is for storing ... GUI screen display parameters').

Regarding Claim 32: Finch discloses a computer-readable medium containing a data structure for storing a form (col. 10, lines 55-60 'a database ... GUI screen display parameters'), the data structure comprising: a database table containing a set of application program variables associated with the form stored (col. 8, lines 55-58 'Database 216 is for storing customized display parameters'), the database table storing the set of application program variables as objects (col. 10, lines 61-63 'table of objects'); and a master controller object (col. 10, lines 61-63 'course object layer ... can access a whole table of objects as one object') to interrogate the database table, state information associated with the objects being transmitted to the database table (col. 8, lines 55-58 'Database 216 is for storing customized display parameters') so as to provide a distributed environment snapshot to the master controller object (col. 10, lines 61-63 'course object layer ... can access a whole table of objects as one object').

Regarding Claim 33: Finch discloses a computer coupled to a network, comprising: Transmitting the form over the network from the computer to a second computer (col. 15, lines 53-58 'storing the received GUI screen definitions') and storing the states in database tables or software containers on the second computer (col. 15, lines 53-58 'storing the received GUI screen definitions').

Finch does not explicitly disclose using a cookie to store the state information of the user generated GUI, but The Microsoft Computer Dictionary 5th ed. defines a cookie as '... a block of data that a Web server stores on a client system ...'. Given this definition it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to use a cookie to store the data and changes generated by the GUI editing process as

well as any information entered into the form once it was generated, because the data would need to be stored on the client in a format that was easily transferred to and from a Web server as indicated by the connection between client 204 and TKET server 208 shown in Fig 2.

14. Claims 34-36 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over US 6,750,885 to Finch et al. (Finch) in view of US 6,046,740 to LaRoche (LaRoche).

Regarding Claim 34: The rejection of claim 33 is incorporated; further, Finch does not disclose using an array holder to store the application states. But does disclose storing the application states in a database table in the second computer (col. 15, lines 53-58 'storing the received GUI screen definitions')

LaRoche teaches using an array to store objects (col. 18, lines 34-36 'an array of objects') in an analogous art for the purpose of describing a GUI form (col. 18, lines 52-55 'allows the client to obtain ... the logical structure of the display').

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to use the array taught by LaRoche to store the form state data disclosed in Finch, because one of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to provide a data structure to hold the form state data (col. 18, lines 52-55 'allows the client to obtain ... the logical structure of the display').

Regarding Claim 35: The rejection of claim 34 is incorporated; further, Finch does not disclose the array being accessible using scripting languages on the client, but official

Art Unit: 2124

notice is taken that it was well know at the time of the invention that scripting languages were fully capable of manipulating arrays and it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to use such scripting languages to do in an HTML environment as disclosed in Finch's invention (col. 16, lines 35-48 '(HTML) is appropriate for a full GUI screen page being transmitted').

Regarding Claim 36: The rejection of claim 34 is incorporated; further, Finch discloses sending the data collection from the computer to the client (col. 15, lines 30-33 'provides the options to the user for making changes to the GUI').

Conclusion

15. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. US 6,353,448 to Scarborough et al. discloses GUI creation. US 2002/0163535 A1 to Mitchell et al. discloses GUI creation. US 6,714,219 B2 to Lindhorst et al. discloses storing GUI objects in arrays. 6,262,729 B1 to Marcos et al. discloses storing GUI objects in arrays. 2002/0,089,539 A1 to Lindhorst et al. discloses the use of cookies. 2003/0,182,469 A1 to Lok et al. discloses the use of cookies.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Jason Mitchell whose telephone number is (571) 272-3728. The examiner can normally be reached from 7:30am - 5:00pm.

Art Unit: 2124

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Kakali Chaki can be reached on (571) 272-3719. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Jason Mitchell
10/12/04


ANIL KHATRI
PRIMARY EXAMINER